

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 is cancelled without prejudice. Claim 2 is rewritten to incorporate the substance of Claim 1. Claims 2-4 remain in this application, with Claims 3 and 4 previously allowed and Claim 2 indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner's objections to Claims 1 and 4 are noted. However, instead of amending those claims as suggested by the Examiner, the undersigned is changing "conductors" to --conductor tracks-- in the wording formerly at Claim 1, line 2 and in Claim 4, line 1. The specification shows that "conductor tracks" and "conductors" are used interchangeably (page 1, lines 4 and 5). Accordingly, the undersigned submits that amending the claims to read "said flat conductors in conductor tracks", as suggested by the Examiner, might be construed as inconsistent with the above-mentioned wording in the specification. Moreover, the suggestion to insert --in said conductor-- before "tracks" in Claim 1, line 4, would have resulted in the wording "between adjacent conductor in said conductor tracks...", which also seems inconsistent with the aforementioned wording in the specification.


In any case, the undersigned submits that the current wording of claims 2 and 4 is free of objectionable language.

S/N 09/877,837

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Roger T. Frost  
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: June 23, 2004

Merchant & Gould, LLC  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

